

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS PO Box 1450 Alexasofan, Virginia 22313-1450 www.nepto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/771,074	02/03/2004	Joel F. Zuhars	137782 (MHM - 15221US01)	1973	
23446 MCANDREW	7590 04/02/200 'S HELD & MALLOY,	EXAM	EXAMINER		
500 WEST M.	ADISON STREET	BITAR, NANCY			
SUITE 3400 CHICAGO, II	, 60661		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			2624	2624	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			04/02/2009	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
10/771,074	ZUHARS ET AL.		
Examiner	Art Unit		
NANCY BITAR	2624		

	Examiner	AILOIIL	1				
	NANCY BITAR	2624					
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ears on the cover sheet with the o	correspondence add	ress				
THE REPLY FILED 23 March 2009 FAILS TO PLACE THIS AF	PLICATION IN CONDITION FOR	ALLOWANCE.					
application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of App- for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 (periods:	The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 4.1.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:						
 a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing date of the final rejection. b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever in one event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. 							
Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).						
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of ex under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checket. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patient term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b) NOTICE OF APPEAL	tension and the corresponding amount of shortened statutory period for reply origing than three months after the mailing date	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Office	ate extension fee te action; or (2) as				
The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exte Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed w.	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the	s of the date of e appeal. Since				
AMENDMENTS							
3. ☑ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because (a) ☑ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below); (b) ☑ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);							
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in bet appeal; and/or		ducing or simplifying t	ne issues for				
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).	corresponding number of finally reje	ected claims.					
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.1.	mpliant Amendment (l	PTOL-324).					
 Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s). 							
 For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is pro- 		I be entered and an e	xplanation of				
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed:							
Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-3.5-20</u> .							
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE							
The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, bu because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).	it before or on the date of filing a No d sufficient reasons why the affidavi	otice of Appeal will <u>not</u> it or other evidence is	be entered necessary and				
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessar 	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea	al and/or appellant fail:	s to provide a				
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanatio REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	n of the status of the claims after er	ntry is below or attach	ed.				
The request for reconsideration has been considered bu See Continuation Sheet.	t does NOT place the application in	condition for allowan	ce because:				
12. Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i> (s). 13. Other:	(PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)						
_ _							
/Vikkram Bali/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2624	/Nancy Bitar/ Examiner, Art Unit 2624						

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant argues that Jensen does not teach* automatically displaying on an output device each image, the output device is a newly added limitation and require further search and consideration. Moreover Jensen teaches in figure 7 The tracking subsystem 220 processes the coordinate intention 225-235 and passes it to an image processing unit 240 which receives exposure frames from the detector 210 and outputs image frames to the display 250. Moreover, applicant argues that reference does not teach animation.Examiner referes to Jensen figure 7 that teaches a display graphic processor that contructs graphical representation of the instrument.